REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-10, 13 and 14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 10 may be found at least at page 9, lines 20-24, page 14, lines 2-4 and lines 24-25. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,581,090 to Brown in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,118,948 to Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0065844 to Zelakiewicz et al. (hereinafter "Zelakiewicz") and U.S. Patent No. 5,519,227 to Karellas. The Office Action, on page 4, rejects claims 10-14 (Applicants note that claims 10, 13 and 14 are pending in this application) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Ito, U.S. Patent No. 7,339,170 to Deliwala and Karellas. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the current rejections, claims 1 and 10 are amended to recite, among other features, that the detector is connected to a computer that calculates a ratio R of counts of photoelectric peaks ascribable to the scintillators by calculating a sum total T and ratios R = (A/T, B/T, C/T), wherein A, B and C are counts of the photoelectric peaks.

None of the currently-applied references can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, such a specific calculation scheme as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Brown is directed to a system for determining the position of a plurality of objects carrying sources of radiation relative to a detector for the radiation that includes means for modulating each of the radiation sources at a different frequency (Abstract). Brown teaches, at col. 5, line 66, a formula for determining the tangent of angle θ by using equation (8). The

recited equation that calculates the ratio R is much more simplistic than the formula in Brown for determining the tangent of angle θ. Therefore, Brown cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the specific calculation recited in independent claims 1 and 10.

For at least the foregoing reason, and because none of the other currently-applied references can be considered to make up for the above-identified shortfall in Brown, no combination of the currently-applied references can reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Further, dependent claims 8, 9, 13 and 14 would also not have been suggested by the asserted combinations of references for at least the dependence of these claims on independent claims 1 and 10, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 8-10, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the currently-applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 8-10, 13 and 14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

JAO:MJS/acd

Date: June 18, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461